IN THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner has requested correction to Figure 7B or amendment to the specification to add reference 754. Applicant has corrected the specification. No new matter has been added. Applicant is submitting a cleaner copy of Figures 1, 2A and 2B. No new matter has been added.

Please replace paragraph [00112] with the following:

[00112]   Afterwards, processing logic increments S_t by J number of tokens (processing block 750) and determines whether location S_t is still within the message (processing box 752). If the determination is positive, the process transitions to processing block 738. Otherwise, processing logic reports textblocks with Ai that exceed the predetermined size and have unique column numbers (processing block [[758]] 754).

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed February 10, 2006. Claims 1-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 18-20, 22-26 and 29-32 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-32 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 1-32 have been amended to replace the term "pre-selected sensitive data" with the term "pre-selected data". The term "if ... is detected" has been replaced with the term "upon detecting ..." in claims 1, 20, 31 and 32. Claim 13 has been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "abstract data structure." Claims 19 and 30 have been amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "application."

With respect to claims 17 and 28, they recite the limitation "each persistent storage device." Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation has a sufficient antecedent basis in claims 17 and 18 because it uses the term "persistent storage device" with the pronoun "each."

Claims 1-3, 6-15, 20, 21, 24-26, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shannon, (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter "Shannon").

Claims 4, 5, 16-19, 22, 23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon, as applied to claims 1-3, 6-15, 20, 21, 24-26, 31 and 32 above, and further in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter "Brandt"). As discussed below,

the pending claims are patentable over the above references.

Shannon discloses an access control technique to limit access to information available on the Internet. Shannon uses a network-walker which "continually surfs the web and examines Internet content providers to gather newly found URL's and IP addresses of web servers or other content providing computers" (Shannon, col. 10, lines 2-6).

Accordingly, Shannon at most discloses examining data stored on **servers** of Internet content providers. The presently claimed invention, in contrast, discloses searching contents of data storage media of a **client device**. Thus, Shannon does not teach or suggest the limitations of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 1:

> ... searching contents of a plurality of data storage media of a client device for pre-selected data; and
> upon detecting at least a portion of the pre-selected data, sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data to a system via a network.

Similar language is also included in independent claims 20, 31 and 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20, 31 and 32, and their corresponding dependent claims, is patentable over Shannon.

Brandt does not help Shannon to render the presently claimed invention unpatentable because Brandt lacks the same limitation that is missing from Shannon (i.e., searching contents of data storage media).

Thus, the references cited by the Examiner, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claims 1-32. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) and submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT AUTHORIZATION

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 5, 2006

Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 45,750

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300